DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 162 EA 011 437

TITLE	An Evaluation of Eugene Public Schools Community Schools Program.
INSTITUTION	Eugene School District 4J, Oreg. Div. of Research, Development, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Feb 79
NOTE	83p.; Not available in paper copy due to small or broken print of parts of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Community Agencies (Public); *Community Involvement; *Community Schools; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Interagency Cooperation; Interagency Coordination; Interviews; Organizational Communication; *Program Improvement; Recordkeeping; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Eugene Public Schools OR

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempted to determine if the Eugene, Oregon School District 4J community schools program was accomplishing its goals. Researchers completed interviews with 770 community residents, 46 community school teachers, 45 noncommunity school teachers, 14 principals, and 154 agencies. Researchers found that no community school had carried out a successful comprehensive survey of the needs and interests of residents. Overall, participation and volunteering were not greater at community schools than at noncommunity schools, although socioeconomic differences may have confounded this finding. Regarding the meeting of needs in curriculum and instruction, 19 of the 36 objectives of the 7 community schools programs were met, 12 were partially met, 4 were unmet, and 1 was unverifiable. It was found that community schools offer their students slightly more field trips and significantly more instructional services to school children. Representatives of participating organizations reported that the program did not improve communication or cooperation among agencies but the program did enhance communication between community residents and organizations. Evaluators recommended that school district and city representatives should discuss program goals, that record keeping and accountability should be improved, and that the district should consider issuing additional guidelines. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168162

AN EVALUATION OF EUGENE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

February 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Hendrickson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

School District 4J
Research, Development and
Evaluation Division
200 North Monroe Street
Eugene, Oregon 97402
(503) 687-3311

EA 011 437

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables and Figures.....iii

Summary..... v

Introduction..... unpaged

City and District Goals for Community Schools..... 1

Fragmentation in Purpose and Record-Keeping Systems..... 2

Data Reporting Problems in the Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports..... 4

Discussion of Figure 3..... 6

Discussion of Figure 4..... 7

Additional Comments on Data Reporting Problems..... 8

GOAL I..... 9

GOAL II..... 11

The Community Survey..... 12

The Methodology of the Survey..... 12

What Proportion of the Population Uses the Schools?..... 13

Are There Differences Between School Areas With Community School Programs and Areas Without the Programs?..... 13

Participation and Senior Citizens..... 15

Differences in the Volunteer Rate Between Community and Non-Community School Areas..... 16

Discussions of Other Differences Between Community and Non-Community School Areas..... 16

What are the Most Important Factors Affecting Participation and Volunteer Rates in the Schools?..... 17

The Dependent Variables Used in the Multiple Regression..... 17

The Independent Variables Used in the Multiple Regression..... 17

Results..... 18

GOAL III..... 20

Introduction..... 20

How Goal III Was Studied..... 20

A Summary of Results Obtained Following Study of Goal III..... 22

School-by-School Analysis..... 25

A Summary of How Many Objectives Were Completed..... 49

A Comparative Look at Schools With and Without Community School Programs..... 49

Classroom Speakers..... 50

Use of Classroom Volunteers..... 51

Field Trips..... 53

After-School Activities..... 54

GOAL IV..... 55

Results of Interviewing Organizations That Used the Community School Program..... 55

Results of the Interviews..... 60

Did the Community Schools Studied Attain Goal IV?..... 64

Conclusion..... 65

GOAL V..... 66

A Survey of Community School Advisory Council Members..... 67

A Lack of Accountability in the Chain of Command..... 68

Concluding Comments..... 68

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables

Table I Results of Visits to 1,050 Addresses..... 13

Table II Cross Tabulation Showing Where People Lived and Where They Went to Participate in the Schools..... 14

Table III School Objectives for District Goal Which Were Met, Partially Met, or Unmet..... 49

Table IV Use of Classroom Speakers by Community School and Non-Community School Teachers, 1977-78 School Year..... 50

Table V Use of Classroom Volunteers by Community School and Non-Community School Teachers, 1977-78 School Year..... 51

Table VI Who Recruits Volunteers for Teacher?..... 52

Table VII The Number of Field Trips by Community School and Non-Community School Teachers, 1977-78 School Year..... 53

Table VIII Organized After-School Activities at Community Schools and Non-Community Schools..... 54

Table IX Numbers of Organizations Which Were Used or Listed by the Community Schools from Format 3-F, Item 3, Year-End Evaluation..... 58

Table X Numbers of Organizations Which Used or Had Contact With Community Schools or Whose Contact Could Not be Verified..... 60

Table XI "People Visits" for Organizations in Groups 1 and 2 by School Based on Reported Organizational Estimates, 1977-78 School Year..... 63

Figures

Figure 1 City and District Goals for Community Schools..... 1

Figure 2 Page Seven of the Community Schools Mid-Year Evaluation Report of March 20, 1978..... 4

Figure 3 Table III from Page Sixteen of the Community Schools Year-End Evaluation Report of November, 1978..... 6

Figure 4 Table II from Page Fourteen of the Community Schools Year-End Evaluation Report of November, 1978..... 7

Summary

The following is a summary of the evaluation of the community schools program.

On December 5, 1977, the Eugene School District 4J school board requested that the community schools program be evaluated. Subsequently, nine members of the school board, including incoming and outgoing members, were interviewed and a list of 102 specific questions was elicited from them. Fifteen program staff were also interviewed. A review of these interviews showed that the great majority of questions asked about the program could be answered by determining the extent to which each of the five goals, drawn up for the community schools in August, 1977, was being met. These goals were jointly arrived at by the City of Eugene and the school district.

The Eugene City and Eugene School District 4J goals for the community schools are:

Goal I To develop processes to identify needs and interests, establish objectives by priority, and identify resources to meet the prioritized objectives of the local community school area.

A. To aid all segments of the local community to identify that community's needs and interests, and to prioritize those needs and interests it wishes to pursue.

B. To aid all segments of the community to identify resources, both within the local community and in the broader community, appropriate to meet the needs and interests in the order of the established priority.

C. To develop a coordinated program to meet the previously prioritized community needs and interests with the identified resources to the extent possible, given a limited community school budget and limited resources, both within and outside the local community.

Goal II To expand local citizen participation and involvement in decision making and leadership in the community school and in all aspects of civic and community activities.

Goal III To expand the use of human and physical community resources to meet the identified needs of community school instructional staff in the required and optional curriculum and instruction.

Goal IV To expand the level of communication and cooperation among existing community agencies, public and private, and all segments in the delivery of needed community programs and services.

Goal V To expand the use of existing school and community facilities and human resources to their maximum usefulness.

A review of the clarity of the program's goals was made because the wording of the goals was in some cases ambiguous.

The community schools program published, for the 1977-78 school year, Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports containing large amounts of data which might have been very useful to the present evaluation. It was found, however, that these data were not reliable. A written set of definitions for what should be included in each data category does not exist. The figures for each school are not comparable because each coordinator used his or her own interpretation of what the figures should represent. Furthermore, less than half of the numbers supplied by the coordinators for the mid-year and year-end evaluation could be documented. Independent measures of how well each of the five goals was being met were therefore necessary.

Methodology

GOAL I - Evaluators sought to verify that the population of a community school's entire attendance area had been polled to determine the needs and interests which could be met by the community schools. A prioritized list should have been produced from such a survey, and matched within budgetory limits, with a list of resources also identified by the coordinators.

GOAL II - A random sample of households was chosen from seven of the ten community school attendance areas, and, for comparison purposes, from seven contiguous non-community school areas. The seven community schools were: Dunn, Edison/Eastside, Patterson, Laurel Hill, Lincoln, Whiteaker, and Willagillespie. The seven non-community schools were: Adams, Condon, Edgewood, Harris, Parker, Meadowlark, and Westmoreland. A total of 1,050 households was randomly selected from the 25,000 households in the fourteen areas. Approximately 1,800 visits were made to the 1,050 addresses and 770 completed interviews were obtained. Interviewers questioned household members as to the extent of their involvement with the schools.

GOAL III - Interviews were conducted with forty-six community school teachers and forty-five non-community school teachers who had taught at the fourteen schools during the 1977-78 school year. Principals in the fourteen schools were also interviewed. The questionnaire items were drawn from the school board members' questions, the community schools own objectives under District Goal III, and a list of expected impacts of community school programs developed from a literature review and interviews with community education specialists, community school coordinators and community school principals. Comparisons are made between community and non-community schools in the use of classroom volunteers, after-school programs, classroom speakers, and field trips. These topics were all chosen to reflect the impact of the community school in the classroom. Community school principals were also interviewed to determine the effect of the community school programs on their school's regular staff. Non-community school principals were interviewed for purposes of comparison.

GOAL IV - In the Year-End Evaluation Report, community school coordinators listed 191 groups, organizations, agencies which had "utilized the Community School Operations" during the 1977-78 school year. Five hundred telephone calls were made to these agencies and 154 telephone interviews were completed. The questionnaire items were designed to elicit information about who participated in a particular group's activities, how beneficial was the use of the community school program to that group, and whether the community programs were meeting their stated goals concerning organizations and agencies.

GOAL V - This goal was not studied because it would have required a survey of building usage and since the majority of the data for this evaluation was gathered during the summer vacation months, it would not be an accurate reflection of the levels of usage during the school year. Similarly, it

should be pointed out that all of the interview data covered events which had happened up to a year earlier, and relied largely on interviewees' memories. Under these conditions some inaccuracies are unavoidable and the results which follow must be read with this in mind.

Results

A review of the program goals and its record keeping indicates that the wording of the goals does not clearly identify the purpose of the program and the record-keeping system needs substantial improvement.

GOAL I

No community school had carried out a successful comprehensive survey of the needs and interests of the residents in its attendance area. Consequently, an accurate ranking of these desires was not possible nor was a systematic matching of needs and interests with lists of available resources done. Goal I is not being met. The tasks detailed by Goal I should be narrowed.

GOAL II

One hundred eighty-two of the households contained members who attended activities at either a community or a non-community school. This translates to some 5,000 households out of a total population, in the area from which the samples were drawn, of 25,000 households.

Other findings were:

1. Of households having one or more members attending an activity at an elementary school, eighty-five percent of those living in a non-community school area attended a non-community school, while eighty-two percent of those living in a community school area attended a community school.
2. Participation in school activities is somewhat higher in non-community school areas than it is in community school areas. However, the difference is not statistically significant.

3. In the area surveyed, an estimated 500 senior citizens participated in a school activity. All of these activities occurred at community schools.

4. Monthly estimates of volunteer hours, estimates of the number of volunteer activities and per person estimates of volunteer activities were all statistically significantly higher at non-community schools.

5. Some ten percent more people in community school areas report that they know more about activities at their local elementary schools, that they are interested in attending activities and that their participation and volunteer time at the schools has increased.

In an attempt to determine which factors most influence participation and volunteer rates in schools, a step-wise multiple regression was run. It was found that the most important factor effecting both volunteering and participation was whether or not there were school-age children in the household.

Of lesser influence are the following:

1. The total number of activities volunteered is increased if a respondent lives in a non-community school area.

2. A higher education level leads to participation in a greater number of activities.

3. Respondents with higher income tend to volunteer in more activities.

Overall, participation and volunteering are not greater at community schools, compared to non-community schools. However, evaluators did not study the possibility that local citizens involvement may have been considerably lower in community school areas than in non-community school areas because of socio-economic differences between the two.

GOAL III

A school-by-school analysis is reported in the evaluation. Overall, nineteen of the thirty-six Goal III objectives that the seven programs had

were considered to have been met, twelve partially met, four unmet and one was not verifiable. Dunn, Laurel Hill and Whiteaker were less successful than the other schools in meeting their objectives and this is attributed in part to the fact that each has had a change of coordinator during the 1977-78 school year.

Coordinators expressed a desire for more teacher involvement in community council meetings and program goal setting. Principals said that the community school program causes some increase in their workload and that of their staffs, especially when the program does not have its own telephone line. Custodial time is also increased at three of the schools.

It is estimated that about half of the teachers in schools with the program were enthusiastic about it. About one-third of the teachers did not view the program as a benefit and the remainder saw some value in it.

People associated with community schools repeatedly stressed to evaluators the importance of the principal in the program's operation. Principals are responsible for the community school program in their schools. Principals carry out personnel evaluation of community school coordinators and approve the coordinator's budget.

Interview data were collected from both community and non-community schools for the purpose of measuring the differential effect of the community school program. It was found that community schools offer their students slightly more field trips and significantly more after-school programs. Teachers in community schools receive assistance in volunteer recruitment, field trip planning, and speaker recruitment from the community school program staff. Twenty-two percent of the community school teachers stated that they had more time for curriculum planning due to this type of assistance.

Slightly more teachers in non-community schools used speakers than did their community school counterparts. Non-community school teachers also used more speakers per teacher. Non-community school teachers did their own speaker recruitment and field trip planning. Volunteer recruitment in non-community schools was done primarily by the counselors and the teachers themselves. Coordinators in community schools perform activities that are done by higher paid certified staff in schools without community programs.

In general, the presence of the community school program did not result in significantly more instructional services to school children. This situation is not likely to change without guidelines from the district outlining what constitutes implementation of Goal III.

GOAL IV

The telephone interviews resulted in evaluators being able to more precisely identify the nature of each organization and its relationship with the community schools. The types of groups using the community schools range from city and county agencies to special interest groups and classes sponsored and presented by one individual. Twenty-three of the programs were only made possible by the existence of community schools, while others used these schools as well as a number of other facilities. Sixty-seven of the programs served the local community almost exclusively, while others drew participants from the entire metro area. Some of the businesses listed were used by the community schools for programs.

A wider variety of activities take place in schools with community programs. The community schools have developed relationships with other organizations which go beyond the schools simply being used as meeting places. Fifty-four of the organizations contacted said that it would have been either more difficult or impossible to offer their programs if the community schools did not exist.

The first part of Goal IV is "To expand the level of communication and cooperation among existing community agencies." This is not being done, according to interview responses, nor is it even an explicit objective of any of the community schools. Evaluators question whether it is an appropriate function of community school coordinators.

The second part of Goal IV has been interpreted by evaluators to mean that the community schools will help to enhance the communication between community residents and organizations. This is being accomplished in part. Forty-six of the organizations felt that their communication with community residents had improved, primarily through the community school newsletters. Thirty-four of the organizations thought that one or more people had been referred to them by the community school, although only fifteen felt that attendance at their meetings was improved by their being at a community school.

The organizations themselves were very satisfied with their experience at community schools and many found them indispensable for delivering their programs at a very local level. Furthermore, there appeared to be no evidence of duplication of services offered through other facilities at the community level.

Overall, program efforts are fragmented. Critical objectives are not systematically identified nor are resources concentrated in ways that yield high payoffs. Information about program results is not being fed back into decisions about future program activities.

Two school programs, at Edison and Lincoln, appear to be doing very well. Both of these programs have had the same full-time coordinator for at least the last three years. The principals at both schools have been there for some time and are knowledgeable about the program operations.

If the school board wishes to improve the community school's efficiency then evaluators recommend:

1. Representatives of the City of Eugene and the school district should meet face-to-face to talk about the program's goals.
2. The program's record keeping be improved.
3. The accountability in the program's chain of command be improved.
4. The district should consider issuing guidelines stating what are the anticipated benefits to school children of having a community schools program and how these benefits will be established.

Readers are advised not to draw conclusions based upon the summary. The report itself should be considered before conclusions are reached.

Introduction

On December 5, 1977, the Eugene School Board asked that the "Community School" program be evaluated. Funds for the evaluation were approved by the 1977-78 Budget Committee and placed in the 1978-79 school district budget. The City of Eugene and the school district are spending approximately $180,000 on the program this fiscal year.

Members of the school board were interviewed in the spring of 1978. The nine interviews with present and incoming board members raised 102 questions. Approximately fifteen interviews were conducted with teachers, principals, and community school coordinators. An item analysis was made of these interviews to identify what about the program should be evaluated. A comparison of the questions asked with the program's five stated goals showed that most of the questions could be answered by determining how well the program's goals were being met.

This evaluation introduces the goals of the program. It then discusses difficulties in interpreting what they mean and considers problems in the programs record keeping. Each of the goals is then discussed in turn with special emphasis upon Goals II, III, and IV. The Research, Development and Evaluation Division (RD&E) used a different research technique to study each goal. A random sample of addresses was taken to study the community participation envisioned in Goal II, the effect of the program on the school's curriculum and instruction, as intended by Goal III, was studied through interviewing principals and school staff, and a telephone survey of agencies and organizations was conducted as part of the study of Goal IV's emphasis upon helping community agencies. After the goals are discussed, additional comments are made about a survey of community school advisory council members and managerial weaknesses within the program's structure.

Data gathering for the study was done during July, August, and September of 1978. Approximately twenty people participated in various phases of data gathering or data analysis.

City and District Goals for Community Schools

Figure 1 contains the wording of the five goals mutually negotiated by the city manager's office and the community school program staff. These goals were approved in August, 1977, by the city council and the District 4J school board. District 4J teachers were not involved in the negotiations about the selection of goals.

Goal I To develop processes to identify needs and interests, establish objectives by priority, and identify resources to meet the prioritized objectives of the local community school area.

A. To aid all segments of the local community to identify that community's needs and interests, and to prioritize those needs and interests it wishes to pursue.

B. To aid all segments of the community to identify resources, both within the local community and in the broader community, appropriate to meet the needs and interests in the order of the established priority.

C. To develop a coordinated program to meet the previously prioritized community needs and interests with the identified resources to the extent possible, given a limited community school budget and limited resources, both within and outside the local community.

Goal II To expand local citizen participation and involvement in decision making and leadership in the community school and in all aspects of civic and community activities.

Goal III To expand the use of human and physical community resources to meet the identified needs of community school instructional staff in the required and optional curriculum and instruction.

Goal IV To expand the level of communication and cooperation among existing community agencies, public and private, and all segments in the delivery of needed community programs and services.

Goal V To expand the use of existing school and community facilities and human resources to their maximum usefulness.

FIG. 1—City and District Goals for Community Schools

These goals have been adopted by the district and the 1977-78 school year was the first year the goals were used.

Fragmentation in Purpose and Record-Keeping Systems

An examination of the terms used in the goals shows that at least six of these terms have ambiguous or vague meanings. Clarity of purpose is desirable in program goals because it promotes the efficient concentration of resources. Clarity is also useful in evaluation. It is necessary to review the wording of the goals to establish what the purpose of the program is.

Goal I establishes a three-stage process: "all segments of the local community" are to be aided to develop processes to identify their "needs and interests" and these needs and interests are to be ranked in order of priority. All possible resources are to be identified and then a "coordinated program" is to be put together which matches the "previously prioritized community needs and interests" with available resources.

The word "community" has vague meanings. It appears to presume some shared sentiment or commonality among a group of people living in a school attendance area. Is it possible that some attendance areas do not have a "community" or have a low degree of community?

What does the phrase "all segments of the local community" mean? How does a community school coordinator know when "all segments" have been aided? Is the segmenting to be done by age, occupation, education or some other criterion? What is a "need"? How does a "need" differ from an "interest"? How does a "need" differ from a "desire"? And is a single representative from each segment to be interviewed, or is it to be a certain minimal proportion of the individuals in the "segment"?

Goal I (C) calls for a "coordinated program" to be developed. What is being coordinated with what? Are the resources being coordinated with one another to avoid duplication of services, or are the resources to be coordinated with available rooms to allow the most efficient use of the building space? "Coordinated" may also be superfluous, since the very act of meeting a set of prioritized needs requires coordination of both resources and facilities.

In Goal II, the words "all" aspects of "civic" and community activities require further clarification, especially for evaluation purposes. To determine whether involvement is expanding in "all" areas, an exhaustive

list would have to be developed, which would probably be impossible. "Civic" may pertain to city affairs or to citizenship in general. Again, this is a very broad category and difficult to study objectively. Does this include political activity to support the city and school district budget elections?

Goal IV, as written, seems to imply that the community schools should foster "communication and cooperation" between various community agencies, and also that they help increase this communication and cooperation between the agencies and "all segments." The first part of this is a major task which the community schools may not be in a position to accomplish. "All segments" is taken to mean all segments of the local community. Furthermore, the words "need" and "needed" should be eliminated or supplemented by "and desired" since many of the programs cater to resident's interests rather than their needs.

The wording of the goals does not clearly identify the purpose of the program.

Questions to teachers, principals, and other people interviewed were made after a review of preliminary interviews with school board members and district staff. Working within the indeterminate implications of the goals, evaluators constructed a checklist of what the program should be doing and devised questions to see how well the program was doing what it should be doing.

Existing program data are often used to answer questions about program operations. However, in this case, evaluators were hampered by widespread problems in the program's record keeping. Two reports covering the 1977-78 school year were prepared by the Community Services Specialist's office, a mid-year and a year-end evaluation report. Data from these reports is looked at in the next section.

Data Reporting Problems in the Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports

Figure 2 consists of page seven of the Mid-Year Evaluation Report. This report was presented to the Eugene School Board on March 20, 1978.

Much of the following set of data is also of the same type collected, printed and presented last year. Please keep in mind that when reviewing last years figures it was for September 1, 1976 through March 31, 1977. This years data is for September 1, 1977 through January 31, 1978, or two months less time (5 months vs. 7 months). These figures also do not reflect the summer programs provided through volunteer efforts by several of the community school coordinators in cooperation with other agencies and community volunteers.

Participant Categories	Program Volunteers	Volunteer Hours	Activity Leaders	Scheduled Activities	In-School	TOTAL people in Leadership
Laurel Hill	211	288	32	260	36	243
Lincoln	107	2,166	85	50	572	192
Patterson	70	1,594	146	282	178	216
Whiteaker	145	3,980	75	95	no data	220
Coburg	143	1,208	24	22	1,560	167
Dunn	21	2,295	16	60		45
Willagillespie	320	21,081	298	68	3,269	618
Edison	442	2,654	224	215	896	666
Madison	39	500	24	31	4	67
Willard	68	242	31	16	65	164
Totals 9/1/77-1/3//78	1,498	38,608	995	1,099	6,580	2,598
Totals 9/1/76-3/31/77	1,210	35,529	656	436	no record	no record

Overall the community schools are making very good progress in meeting the ambitious goals established by the School District 4J Board and the Eugene City Council through the completion of locally developed specific objectives. This is also reflected and supported by the statistical data.

In looking at the data in this report it should be noted that Laurel Hill and Dunn did not get started until a couple of months after the other community schools due to problems that were encountered with the CETA program. Dunn and Laurel Hill also have had this year, and for the past several years, less than full time staff and less than adequate program support funds. This has concerned the Community Schools Coordinating Committee, and it has unanimously recommended full time and support funds for the less than full time community schools. It has also recommended the addition of Frances Willard Elementary as a community school for 1978-1979. Frances Willard did not get started until January 3, 1978, when CETA funds became available that will last until June.

Through the information presented in these reports, you will also fina a great deal of interaction and mutual support with city and county funded or supported programs and services. These include the police department, neighborhood organizations, the city library, the planning department, the community recreation centers, etc.

This has led to questions being raised at top administrative levels regarding the issues of duplication of services and competition for participants. This is due in part also to a lack of understanding and involvement by the top level administrators and elected board and council members which could be alleviated through a work session or liaison

(7)

FIG. 2 - Page Seven of the Community Schools Mid-Year Evaluation Report of March 20, 1978

When interviewed during April and May of 1978, board members were asked by evaluators if they had seen the Mid-Year Evaluation Report. Two board members questioned the accuracy of information presented in the tables. On page seven, for example, how is it that Willagillespie records 320 "program volunteers" and 21,081 "volunteer hours" whereas Edison records 442 "program volunteers" yet has 2,654 "volunteer hours"? How is it that Willagillespie records 298 "activity leaders" but only had 68 "scheduled activities" whereas Laurel Hill had 32 "activity leaders" but 260 "scheduled activities"?

The Year-End Evaluation Report, as published by the Community Services Specialist's office in December, 1978, contains two data tables. These tables are reproduced as Figures 2 and 3. Twelve data reporting categories are used in the two tables.

All coordinators were asked to document the data presented for their schools. Coordinators at Dunn, Laurel Hill, Madison, Whiteaker, and Willagillespie were unable to document any figure listed in the two tables. Only some of the figures reported for Patterson could be verified. With exceptions, data for Coburg, Edison, Lincoln, and Willard could be roughly verified to within a range of fifteen percent plus or minus. Some categories of data reported in Figures 2 and 3 were underestimated at Coburg, Edison, and Willard.

All coordinators interviewed expressed a need for a better record-keeping system. No written set of definitions currently exists which show how to define these categories. Two coordinators hired during 1977-78 said they had not received training in how to report program data. Coordinators have various interpretations of what their data categories mean.

PARTICIPANTS	PROGRAM VOLUNTEERS	VOLUNTEER HOURS	ACTIVITY LEADERS	SCHEDULED ACTIVITIES	IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL PEOPLE IN LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES
COBURG	228	2,708	53	45	2,785	215
DUNN	26	440	20	30	3,639	40
EDISON	942	5,680	474	454	4,183	950
LAUREL HILL	471	6,922	186	611	93 (A)	657
LINCOLN	251	4,020	103	71	923 (B)	149
MADISON	117	1,600	75	97	600	189
PATTERSON	132	2,939	216	497	430	286
WHITEAKER	386	9,432	162	210	1,024	220
WILLAGILLESPIE	736	5,440	449	135	5,847	683
WILLARD	306	1,977	64	62	1,449	369
END OF YEAR TOTALS	3,594	41,158	1,802	2,262	20,973	4,376
MID-YEAR TOTALS*	1,498	36,608	935	1,099	6,580	2,598
% OF INCREASE	140%	6.6%	81%	106%	334%	68%

(A) Records were not available
(B) "We did not record all the interactions which occured throughout the year."
* Data for nine schools only

FIG. 3 - Table III from Page Sixteen of the Community Schools Year-End Evaluation Report of November, 1978.

Discussion of Figure 3

The category of "Program Volunteers" may or may not include repeat instances of the same person. Some coordinators assume every activity has at least one volunteer and record that someone was a "program volunteer" every time an activity takes place at the school. Some coordinators record people who come to neighborhood advisory committee meetings as "program volunteers". For example, if twelve people attend a neighborhood advisory meeting they are considered to have volunteered to the community. Duplication can also occur here because if the same twelve people meet once a month for nine months, then twelve times nine, or 108, "program volunteers" could be recorded.

The category of "Activity Leaders" is also variously defined. Sometimes it includes duplicated counts of the same people, sometimes it doesn't. "Activity Leaders" are also included as "program volunteers" and are generally counted in both categories. None of the coordinators interviewed was

able to describe the difference between "activity leaders" and "total people in leadership activities". None of the data reported in the category of "Total People in Leadership Activities" could be verified. The Year-End Evaluation Report contains no definition of what "total people in leadership activities" means.

The data reporting categories used in Figure 3 are thus neither mutually exclusive nor unduplicated.

Discussion of Figure 4

The data reporting categories in Figure 4 contain similar definitional problems as well as questionable computational procedures.

"PEOPLE VISITS"	PRESCHOOL	YOUTH (5-18)	ADULTS (18-55)	SENIORS (55+)	FAMILY	TOTALS
COBURG	536	5,352	2,914	578		9,380
DUNN	72	6,516	4,058	219		10,865
EDISON	564	13,099	21,611	1,277		36,551
LAUREL HILL	1,541	9,571	3,605	117		14,854
LINCOLN	2,275	8,774	8,068	931		20,048
MADISON	0	8,902	9,757	780		19,439
PATTERSON	2,544	20,778	13,154	537		38,993
WHITEAKER	2,162	10,986	8,457	1,298		23,353
WILLAGILLESPIE	186	25,804	7,224	300	1,835	36,555
WILLARD	1,344	8,314	2,353	593		12,604
END OF YEAR TOTALS	11,224	118,096	81,201	6,630	1,835	222,648
MID-YEAR TOTALS	5,002	62,156	40,375	2,594	1,206	[illegible]335
% OF INCREASE SINCE MID-YEAR	124%	90%	101%	256%	52%	100%

FIG. 4 - Table II from Page Fourteen of the Community Schools Year-End Evaluation Report of November, 1978.

The YOUTH (5-18) category is defined by coordinators in different ways. For example, if there are ten adults and 198 kids at a Fun Fair, some coordinators will record 198 "youth" contacts and others will report ten times 198 "youth contacts" reasoning that the adults were volunteers and each

adult had 193 contacts. Thus, for that one activity either 198 or 1,980 youth contacts will be recorded.

The category "IN SCHOOL" in Figure 3 is routinely included in "YOUTH (5-18)" in Figure 4. However, when asked to verify this category some coordinators were found to include the "PRESCHOOL" category in "YOUTH (5-18)". Program records at Patterson showed 10,000 fewer youth visits than claimed for the program. The 25,804 "YOUTH (5-18)" visits claimed at Willagillespie could not be verified.

All categories of data on this table contain duplicated people.

Records from the 1977-78 school year were discarded in two schools at the end of the year and lost at two others.

Additional Comments on Data Reporting Problems

Complete and accurate program records are not being kept. The job description of both the Community Services Specialist and the Community School Coordinator require the positions to "maintain complete and accurate records...."

Differences among coordinators in their interpretation of data categories were referred to on page six of the Mid-Year Evaluation Report. Pages eight and thirty-eight to forty of the Year-End Evaluation Report identify problems in data collection and suggest recommendations for future staff work.

GOAL I

Evaluators interpret this three-part goal to require coordinators to: identify a community's needs, rank the needs in order of importance, identify resources, and make a plan for matching the resources to the needs. All coordinators were interviewed and asked to show how they identified their area's needs, how the needs were ranked, how resources were identified, and what was their plan for matching the resources to the needs.

Coordinators had no survey of their area's needs and interests unless someone else did it, such as Lane County's Health and Social Services or unless it was done as part of the proposal to establish a community school program at the school, such as at Willard. Those programs which started survey research efforts by themselves did not have high response rates. For example, Laurel Hill sent out a questionnaire in November, 1977, to approximately 1,000 addresses and received twenty responses. Willagillespie sent a questionnaire to 1,500 addresses and received fifty responses. Parent surveys were used and response rates to them were much better than surveys to all the households in the area. Coordinators in at least five schools did some kind of survey of students. Projects get organized as someone expresses an interest in doing them and resources are available to do them.

Few coordinators were able to document the existence of a list ranking community needs and interests. All coordinators had some kind of listing of resources. However, few coordinators had a "coordinated program" as described in Part C of Goal I because needs and interests were not ranked in order of importance.

Coordinators at most of the programs attempted some matching of what they thought people wanted with available resources. However, resources are matched episodically rather than according to a "coordinated program".

Accurate data about the difficulty of carrying out Goal I is not being reported in the evaluation reports prepared by the program. For example, the Mid-Year Evaluation Report asks for a "statement/s of progress and problems." One coordinator made the statement, "These goals are logical, easily understood by community members, and seem to be fairly realistic in

responding to general needs." When questioned, the coordinator said that these words were not an accurate reflection of what he thought about the goals. Evaluators did not study the degree to which principals provided time or budgetary support to carry out tasks required by Goal I.

Goal I is not being accomplished. Communitys' needs are not being identified, needs are not ranked, and coordinated programs are not being put on.

If the City of Eugene and the school district wish to use Goal I as a management tool, then they should provide training and resources to coordinators. It is not appropriate to ask classified employees to carry out research procedures that they have neither the training nor resources to do.

GOAL II

This section of the evaluation looks at Goal II of the city and district goals for community schools. The intent of Goal II is "to expand local citizen participation and involvement in decision making and leadership in the community school in all aspects of civic and community activities." Existing program data cannot be relied upon to decide if this expansion has taken place and evaluators decided to obtain verifiable estimates of school usage.

The sections under Goal II describe the results of a survey of randomly selected addresses in fourteen elementary school attendance areas. These sections provide estimates of the number of people in the fourteen areas that use the schools, systematically analyze differences in participation and volunteering between areas with community school programs and areas without these programs, and then analyze the independent factors which affect participation and volunteer rates.

The Community Survey

Given the vague terms in Goal II and the unreliability of official program data, evaluators chose to conduct a door-to-door survey of Eugene residents and ask them what involvement they had with schools.

Three main questions were asked of the fifty-seven variable data base generated by this survey. First, what proportion of the population actually uses the schools? Second, are there differences in school usage between areas with a community school program and areas without a community school program? Third, what are the major factors affecting why people participate in school activities or volunteer in the schools?

The Methodology of the Survey

There are ten community schools. Three school areas: Coburg, Madison, and Willard, were excluded either because they were in operation for less than a year, lists of dwelling units could not be obtained for them, or they were outside of the City of Eugene. The remaining seven areas were selected. Seven schools without a community school program were also selected. Only schools that shared a boundary with a community school were selected.

The seven community school areas are: Dunn, Edison/Eastside, Patterson, Laurel Hill, Lincoln, Whiteaker, and Willagillespie. The seven non-community school areas are: Adams, Condon, Edgewood, Parker, Harris, Meadow Lark, and Westmoreland.

The area sampled consists of approximately 25,000 dwelling units and stretches from the Laurel Hill Valley in the east to the City View Street and Chambers Street area in the west.

A list of 1,050 addresses was randomly selected from the 25,000 by the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG). Over 1,800 visits were made during August and September of 1978 to these addresses. Table I shows the results of these visits.

TABLE I

Results of Visits to 1,050 Addresses

	Number of Households	Percent of Households
Completed Interview	770	73.4
Out of Town for Extended Period	102	9.7
Place of Business	61	5.8
Refused	38	3.6
Address Does Not Exist	34	3.0
All Other Reasons	23	2.2
Vacant	22	2.1
	1,050	99.8%

Table I shows that completed interviews were obtained at 770, or approximately seventy-five percent of the addresses. All addresses that were not vacant, a place of business, or non-existent were visited until either an interview had been completed or four unsuccessful visits had been made. The non-existence of an address was confirmed by two independent searches for it. Because evaluators used a random sample, the results are generalizable back to the entire 25,000 households in the fourteen attendance areas.

What Proportion of the Population Uses the Schools?

Based on the results of the sample data, it is reasonable to estimate that people in approximately twenty percent, or 5,000 households of the 25,000 households in the areas, participated in an activity at a school or volunteered in one during the 1977-78 school year.

Are There Differences Between the School Areas With Community School Programs and Areas Without the Programs?

Two distinct ways that people can use the schools were studied: participation in some kind of activity and volunteering. These appear to be distinct social processes. This section of the paper examines participation first and then volunteering.

In general, participation rates are higher in areas without community schools. However, the difference in the rate of participation between people in areas with community school programs and areas without community school programs is not statistically significant.

Table II presents sample data showing which area people lived in and where they went, if they went, to a school.

TABLE II

Cross Tabulation Showing Where People Lived
and Where They Went to Participate in the Schools

		Where They Went if They Went to a School to Participate		
		Non-Community School	Community School	Row Total
Where Respondents Lived	Non Community School Area	86* 85.1%	15 14.9%	101 55.5%
	Community School Area	15 18.5%	66 81.5%	81 44.5%
	Column Total	101	81	182 100.0

* Count
Row Percentage

Data from the sample for 182 households are presented in Table II. One hundred and one lived in non-community school areas and eighty-one lived in community schools. Each of the cells in Table II contains two numbers. The first number shows the number of households in the cell.

For example, in the cell in the upper right-hand corner, people in fifteen of the 101 households who live in a non-community school area went to a community school. The second number shows the percent of the row total that is in that cell; fifteen divided by 101 equals 14.9%.

As Table II shows, participation rates are higher in areas without community schools; 55.5% as compared with 44.5%. A little less than half the sample households, eighty-six, lived in a non-community school area and went to a non-community school. A little more than a third, sixty-six, lived in a community school area and went to a community school. Approximately 16.4% of the 182 households participated in a school outside their school's attendance area. There is a small migrational effect in that people in fifteen of the 101 non-community school households went to community school areas and people in fifteen of the eighty-one community school area households went to a non-community school area.

The routine statistical tests done on Table II all show that the data in the table are statistically significant. There is a general trend for people to go to schools that they live close to regardless of whether or not the school has a community program. This general trend is statistically significant. There is also a discernible migrational effect.

Based on the sample data, it is estimated that of the 25,000 households in the areas sampled, the average community school had 109 households visiting it from other areas and the average school without a community school program had forty-four households visiting it from outside of its attendance area.

Participation and Senior Citizens

An estimated 317 of the 25,000 households, containing about 500 seniors, participated in an activity at a school. Examples of these activities are described in the Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports. All of the respondents in these households report going to a community school. There were no reports by senior citizens of attending activities in a non-community school. The most frequently mentioned activity was going to a senior lunch.

Differences in the Volunteer Rate Between Community and Non-Community School Areas

The concept of "volunteer" is not well defined. As noted earlier, coordinators differ among themselves as to what a "volunteer" is. Schools recruit volunteers in different ways. It is reasonable to infer that respondents in the households interpreted the word "volunteer" differently.

Respondents in households in non-community areas report a higher volunteer rate than households in school areas with a community school program. Three different measures were used by evaluators to calculate volunteer rates: monthly estimates of volunteer hours, estimates of the number of volunteer activities, and per person estimates of volunteer activities. All measures showed statistically significant differences. The people in households in non-community school areas volunteered significantly more than people in community school areas.

Discussion of Other Differences Between Community and Non Community School Areas

Ten percent more people in community school areas report that they know about activities at their local elementary school, that they are interested in attending activities, and that their participation and volunteer time at the schools has increased. The ten percent difference is not statistically significant except that significantly more people in households in community school areas report knowing about activities at their local elementary school.

This ten percent difference is consistent with the findings in the June 15, 1978 report entitled, "A Technical Analysis of the Influence of Community Schools in Eugene on School District Budget Election." This was the first report released by evaluators on the program and it found that four percent more of the people in precincts with community schools voted in favor of the school district's budget. The four percent difference was not statistically significant.

There were no differences between households in the two areas on their degree of satisfaction with their local school's activities or friendliness.

What Are the Most Important Factors Affecting Participation and Volunteer Rates in the Schools?

A multiple regression analysis was done to determine which variables affect participation and volunteering. Multiple regression techniques create equations out of dependent and independent variables. These equations are constructed in a way that maximizes the predictability of the dependent variables and identifies how much of the "variance" in a dependent variable is accounted for by the set of independent variables.

The Dependent Variables Used in the Multiple Regression:

Six measures of participation and volunteering were used: a simple YES/NO measure of whether or not anyone in the household participated in activities at the local or other elementary schools, a second measure gives the total number of different activities at the local elementary school that household members participated in during the past year, and a third measure is the respondents' rating of the average number of hours per-month that household members spend in these activities. The fourth and fifth measures are volunteering in activities at the local elementary school. One is the total number of activities in which household members volunteer and the other is the average number of hours per month in which household members volunteer. The sixth dependent measure used is simply an indication of whether anyone in the household attended decision-making meetings at the local school in the past year.

The Independent Variables Used in the Multiple Regression

In examining influences on the participation variable, six independent variables were considered. First, did the respondent live in a community school area? It might be expected that the range of activities in the community schools would enhance participation. Second, the income and education levels of the household are used. Previous research generally indicates that those with more education and income participate more in community activities than those with lower educational and income levels. Third, the distance from the local elementary school is included, with the expectation that those who live closer to the school will more often participate in its activities. Fourth, three measures of the nature of the

household residents are included: whether or not senior citizens live in the home, whether or not there are elementary school-aged children in the home, and whether or not there are junior or senior high school-aged children in the home.

Multiple regression analyses of the effect of satisfaction with the school's activities and friendliness were also run, however, the results are not reported upon here.

Results

The set of independent variables explain close to one fourth of the variation in whether or not household members participate, as well as the number of activities in which they take part. However, these variables explain only about seventeen percent of the variation in the number of hours they are estimated to spend in the activities. The most consistent and most important influence on each of these three participation variables is whether or not elementary school-aged children are in the home. In all cases, having elementary school-aged children greatly increases the probability that someone in the household will participate in school activities, the number of hours people participated, and the total number of activities in which members of the household are involved.

Having people of other ages in the home does not affect these participation measures, nor does distance to the school or whether the school involved has a community school program. Only the level of education has an impact and this is only on the total number of activities participated in. More highly educated households participate in more different activities.

While one-third of the variation in the total number of volunteer activities per household is explained by the set of variables, only thirteen percent of the variation in the average number of hours of volunteer work per household is explained. Having elementary school children in the home is the most important predictor of both the total number of activities in which household members volunteer as well as the average number of hours spent in volunteer activities. No other variable has an important effect on the number of volunteered hours. However, income, the distance to the local school and whether or not it is a community school affect the total

number of volunteer activities. As expected, those with higher income more often volunteer. But, in contrast to the expectation, those farther from the school and those who do not live in a community school district volunteer in more activities. Importantly enough, these influences are independent of the impact of income level and of the composition of the household. Having elementary school children in the home is the only important influence on this participation.

Evaluators did not explicitly study the possibility that participation rates in some community school areas would be substantially lower without the community school programs. The results reported are for all households together and area-by-area analyses were not done.

To summarize, when using the six independent measures, from sixteen to thirty-four percent of the variation in the dependent measures is explained. Being in a non-community school area is an important influence only on the total number of activities volunteered. Education and income influence the total number of activities participated in and the number of volunteer activities; the education level of the respondent primarily affects the former and income influences the latter.

Throughout, the most important influence is whether or not there are elementary school-aged children in the household. Having children in this age range influences total participation and volunteering, the total number of participation or volunteer hours spent, as well as participation in decision-makings activities. The presence or absence of a community school program does not have a substantial effect on the rates of participation and volunteering.

GOAL III

Introduction

This section of the evaluation looks at Goal III of the city and district goals for community schools. The intent of Goal III is "to expand the use of human and physical resources to meet the identified needs of community school instructional staff in the required and optional curriculum and instruction." Evaluators limited their work on this goal to determining the effect of the program or services on school-age children.

There are two parts to this section. The first part explains the methodology used in the study and gives a school-by-school analysis of Goal III implementation. It also contains summary comments about principals and community school coordinators. The second part compares the use of community resources between community schools and non-community schools. There is an overall summary following the second part.

How Goal III was Studied

For the purposes of studying the degree to which Goal III was accomplished, evaluators decided to interview at the same seven community schools studied in Goal II: Dunn, Edison/Eastside, Laurel Hill, Lincoln, Patterson, Whiteaker, Willagillespie, and Willard. Forty-six community school teachers and forty-five teachers from seven schools without a community school program were interviewed. Teachers who taught in 1977-78 and who returned to the same school for the 1978-79 school year were randomly selected for the study. One teacher who had taught in a community school in 1977-78 and had retired was interviewed. One teacher who was a student teacher in 1977-78 and returned to the same school in 1978-79 as a staff member was interviewed. In schools in which there were less than six homeroom teachers, all of the homeroom teachers were interviewed. In schools in which six was less than fifty percent of all homeroom teachers, fifty percent of the teachers were interviewed. Community school coordinators and principals at all schools were interviewed.

Teachers in community schools were interviewed to determine whether or not the community school program in their school was having an educational impact on classroom programs or students. The interview questions

for teachers were developed from three sources: 1) an analysis of school board members' questions about community schools; 2) an examination of each community school's objectives under District Goal III; and, 3) a list of expected impacts of community school programs developed from a literature review and interviews with community education specialists, community school coordinators, and community school principals.

The teacher interview questionnaire contained seventy questions, covering topics such as use of classroom volunteers, after-school programs, classroom speakers, and field trips. In order to obtain comparative data, teachers in non-community schools were interviewed so that evaluators could determine whether there were any differences in activities for children or resources available to teachers in community schools compared to non-community schools.

These interviews were conducted in August and September of 1978. It is estimated that thirty percent of the teachers interviewed stated that it was difficult to remember events that took place the previous school year. The degree to which teachers' ability to recall events affected the results is not known.

Principals are responsible for the operation of community school programs in their school. Principals conduct the personnel evaluation of community school coordinators and approve the coordinator's budget. Community school principals were interviewed to determine how the program affected their jobs and their non-teaching staff, and to determine the principal's role in the program's operation. Principals of schools that do not have a community school program were interviewed to obtain comparative data about how much time principals spend scheduling building use, organizing student activities and administering volunteer programs. The community school principal questionnaire contained forty questions. The questionnaire for non-community school principals contained sixteen questions.

Community school coordinators were interviewed to find out what their role in the program's operations was, and the relationships between the program, the teachers, the principal, and the school's attendance area.

A Summary of Results Obtained in Studying Goal III

The data collected indicates that community schools offer their students slightly more field trips and significantly more after-school programs. Teachers in community schools receive assistance in volunteer recruitment, field trip planning, and speaker recruitment from the community school program staff. Twenty-two percent of the community school teachers stated that they had more time for curriculum planning due to this type of assistance.

Slightly more teachers in non-community schools used speakers than did their community school counterparts. Non-community school teachers also used more speakers per teacher. Non-community school teachers did their own speaker recruitment and field trip planning. Volunteer recruitment in non-community schools was done primarily by the counselors and the teachers themselves.

Principals were also named as volunteer recruiters, though less frequently. One non-community school had a volunteer coordinator appointed by the Parent Teacher Association.

The community schools' teachers and students are receiving some services that their non-community school counterparts are not. Most noticeable are assistance in tasks such as volunteer and speaker recruitment, field trip planning, and organized after-school programs. Teachers in community schools are more likely to go on field trips than teachers in non-community schools. The community school teachers do not provide more community-based educational resources to their students than do non-community school teachers. Community school teachers do receive assistance with those resources they do provide.

Students at community schools have available to them more varied organized after-school activities than their non-community school counterparts do.

There are differences between community schools and non-community schools in the division of labor. Community school program staff are handling some tasks that in non-community schools are handled by certified staff such as principals, curriculum associates, and counselors.

Evaluators question whether recruitment of volunteers and activity scheduling is a cost effective use of certified staff.

Community school programs have had a limited impact on classroom instruction. This situation is not likely to change without guidelines from the district outlining what constitutes implementation of Goal III. Topics covered by these guidelines should include but not be limited to: 1) anticipated effects of a community program on a school's instruction; and, 2) the level and kind of cooperation expected among principals, teachers, and coordinators.

In the community schools, teachers are receiving help in volunteer recruitment. Teachers and students received some instructional help during the school day. Students benefited from organized after-school activities at all of the schools studied.

It is estimated that half of the teachers were enthusiastic about the program and viewed it as a resource to them. One-third of the teachers did not view the program as a benefit to them or their students. The remainder of the teachers interviewed saw the program to be of some value to them.

Coordinators' responses to questions about their relationships with teachers and teachers' roles in community school programs indicated that as a group coordinators would like to see more teacher involvement in community council meetings and goal setting for the program. Coordinators also stated that they would like to see teachers have a better understanding of how they (coordinators) can tie in with what the teachers are doing in their classrooms.

Three schools, Dunn, Laurel Hill, and Whiteaker, were not as successful as other schools in completing their objectives under Goal III. These schools had a change of coordinator either at the beginning of the 1977-78 school year or at the end of the year.

In four of the community schools studied, Dunn, Edison/Eastside, Laurel Hill, and Willagillespie, principals said that the presence of a community school program has led to an increased workload on their clerical staff. The increase in clerical staff work was estimated to be about ten

percent. None of these four schools has a separate telephone line for the community school program. In the three remaining community schools, principals said that the effect on clerical staff was little or none. In each of these schools the community school coordinator has a telephone line separate from the one in the school office.

Principals at Dunn, Lincoln, Whiteaker, and Willagillespie stated that the custodial staff had a large increase in their workload due to the presence of a community school program. The increased workload, estimated at about fifteen percent, was attributable to problems caused by increased facility use.

In response to questions about any increased workloads for themselves, the principals estimated that seven percent of their time was involved in community school program tasks. They further stated that this increase was was offset by the tasks that the community school coordinators were now handling which the principals were previously responsible for. These tasks included, but were not limited to, scheduling building use, meeting with community groups and agencies, informal meetings with parents, and organizing activities for families. Principals in non-community schools estimated that they spent less than three percent of their time in these types of tasks. Data collected implies that there may be fewer activities taking place in non-community schools, therefore, less time would be required for coordination and supervision.

While the objectives for the seven community schools showed considerable variety, several specific types of student activities and instructional resources appear as objectives of the community schools. Providing field trip assistance, recruitment of volunteers and speakers, and organized after-school activities for children were objectives of most of the community schools.

The rest of the discussion under Goal III provides both a school-by-school analysis of community school programs and a comparison of schools with and without community school programs.

School-by-School Analysis

The objectives under Goal III for the seven community schools were restated as questions and asked of community school teachers and coordinators. In this part, data are reported on the degree to which individual schools carried out the objectives they had listed under Goal III. A separate section is presented on each school. Each section opens with a brief historical introduction, discusses all of the objectives of each school, and ends with a brief comment. The comments include data from the interviews that are pertinent to verifying the completion of the school's objectives.

Following the school-by-school descriptions, a table is presented which shows how many objectives each school had and summarizes evaluator's opinions as to which objectives were met, partially met, or unmet.

In determining the impact of the program, evaluators took into account the history of the program, comments made by teachers and principals, the degree to which program objectives were met, and available program statistics.

Introduction

Dunn Elementary School became a community school in 1974. The program was funded half-time until the 1977-78 school year when the program lost its funding for the coordinator's position. In 1977-78, the coordinator position was held by a student who received a .80 FTE position in the University of Oregon's Year for Action (UYA) program. This student received a small stipend from the UYA program as well as University credits. The goals and objectives from the community school program were not written by this student, but by the previous coordinator who began the 1977-78 year as coordinator on a volunteer basis. The UYA student had her own set of goals and objectives which she also used. The operational budget for the program for 1977-78 was funded as a half-time position.

There have been five coordinators and two principals at Dunn school since 1974. The current principal began at Dunn in 1977 and had no previous experience as an administrator in a community school. Dunn had eight objectives implementing District Goal III. Six teachers were interviewed.

Goals and Objectives

1.(a) The community school coordinator and staff will offer to and help organize at least one field trip per month per classroom in to the local community and broader community, in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

The principal and two of the teachers stated that organizing field trips is a way in which the community school program aids teachers and students. The six teachers interviewed went on an average of three trips each last year. Four of the teachers said they organized the trips themselves. The coordinator said that the offer to organize trips was made and it was left up to the teachers as to whether they wanted help or not. The present coordinator stated that her predecessor made up a list of field trip possibilities and presented it to the staff in the fall, Three of the teachers said that they were aware of such a list. The list was not available to the evaluators. The coordinator also said that the objective was not realistic due to lack of money for transportation.

2. The community school coordinator and staff will offer to and help make contacts so that the teachers will have the opportunity to have at least one resource speaker in their class per month for the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

The teachers interviewed used an average of two speakers each last year. One teacher thought that the community school program was involved in arranging for speakers to be there. The coordinator also stated that none of the teachers asked for this kind of help. The coordinator stated that a resource file of speakers was set up in the spring. Two of the teachers interviewed were aware of such a list.

3. The community school coordinator will make available to the teachers at least 75% of the resources that are learned of at workshops and conferences that relate to school curriculum, in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

None of the teachers was aware of this ever taking place. The coordinator stated that information about educational programs learned at an inservice was made available to the teachers through their mailboxes. This information was not available to evaluators.

4. The community school coordinator and staff will organize and offer activities for the elementary age children. These activities will take place immediately after school and will be held at least two days per week. On each of these days the children will be able to choose from at least three activities which they can participate in. These activities will be available to all the children in the school in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

Two of the teachers interviewed stated that an after-school program is a benefit their students get from the community school program. None of the teachers knew how many of their students used the program. Two teachers did not know the program existed. The coordinators stated that an after-school program one day per week was begun in the spring. Approximately ten children attended each day the program was offered. A Latch Key project was offered in conjunction with Francis Willard Elementary School. The coordinator also stated that an after-school chorus was set up in response to students' requests for one.

5. The community school coordinator and staff working with the teachers will organize at least 4 short classes (45 min. or 1 hour) withingthe regular school day, to take place one day per week, for a 3 - 6 week time period. The children would choose ~~xxxxx~~ one of the 4 classes to attend in the 3 - 6 weeks time period. These classes are sometimes called Interest Groups or Mini Groups and usually consist of learning skills not taught in the regular classroom, such as guitar, weaving, puppetry, etc. This would start in Jan. ~~xx~~ of 1978.

Discussion

Interest groups did not take place last year. The coordinator and the principal both said that the idea was presented to the teachers and that they were against it.

6. The community school coordinator will arrange and invite a person from the community interested in the school curriculum to come to 50% of school staff meetings to hear problems of, and offer ideas to the teachers at the school in the school year 1977-78. (based on teachers okay at next staff meeting).

Discussion

There are discrepancies in the responses of those interviewed. Four of the teachers said that there are never members of the public at staff meetings. Two teachers said there was frequent attendance. However, it appears that the attendance was not for the purposes stated in the objectives. The coordinator said that this proposal was not presented to the staff. The principal stated that people were invited through the school newsletter, but that none came.

7. The community school coordinator and staff working with the P.T.O. will find a community person, parent or non-parent, to become a room representative to a classroom, for the school year 1977-78. He or she would help out the teacher in at least two-thirds of the ~~xxxx~~ special activities that the classroom takes part in. One condition being that the room representative is given proper notice of at least one week before an activity. Also, he or she would attend at least 80% of the combined P.T.O. and D.N.A. meetings.

Discussion

All of the teachers interviewed said that they had a "room mother" last year. Two said that their room mother did not do anything last year. The teachers that used them were very satisfied with their help at parties and on field trips. Two of the room representatives went to most of the combined meetings.

8. The community school coordinator will invite and urge at least one teacher to be at 90% of the community council meetings in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

Four of the teachers reported being invited to council meetings. None of them had ever attended any meetings.

Comments

The community school program at Dunn appears to have made little impact on the educational program. In the opinion of the evaluators, three objectives were unmet and five were partially met. This differs from the program's self-assessment of June, 1978, in which four objectives were considered met, three unmet, and one partially met. Differences in whether or not objectives were met are due to differences in interpretation.

Volunteer recruitment for the classroom teacher was an objective stated for District Goal V, and was not included in the discussion above. However, all of the teachers said that the coordinator did solicit requests for volunteers last year; five of the teachers used volunteers last year.

Contributing factors to the lack of impact appear to be: unrealistic objectives, high turnover in the coordinator position, inconsistent community support, a lack of knowledge and use by teachers of the program's resources, inconsistent financial support from the school district, lack of district guidelines for accomplishment of Goal III, and a lack of leadership to correct the problems.

Positive parts of the program appear to be that: teachers like the coordinator, the principal is actively helping to improve the visibility of the program, and for the first time, a coordinator has stayed more than one year.

Introduction

Edison/Eastside became a half-time community school in 1974. In 1976, the program became full time. The current principal has held his position since the program began in 1974. The present coordinator has held his position since 1975. Eastside is an alternative school that used the ground floor of the Edison building. Six teachers were interviewed at Edison and six at Eastside. Edison/Eastside had seven objectives implementing Goal III.

Goals and Objectives

1. **The community school staff will recruit volunteers for 75% of all teacher requests within the specified time, with two weeks prior notice to the c.s. staff.**

Discussion

The principal and four of the teachers stated that the community school program benefits their students by providing classroom volunteers. Eleven teachers used volunteers in their classrooms in 1977-78. All of the teachers said that the community school program recruited volunteers. In addition, seven of the teachers did their own recruiting for parent volunteers. The teachers reported that an average of more than seventy-five percent of their requests for volunteers were met. According to teacher statements, volunteers worked in their classrooms for approximately one hour per day. Teachers were well satisfied with their volunteers. Evaluators did not study whether two weeks prior notice was given to the community school staff.

2. **The community school staff will coordinate and recruit for the U.ofO. ESCAPE volunteer program during the school year for Edison and Eastside staff.**

Discussion

All but one of the teachers that used volunteers also used tutors from the University of Oregon Escape Tutor Program. The Edison teachers said that Escape tutors were recruited by the community school coordinator. The Eastside teachers said that the Eastside teacher's aide recruited Escape tutors through the community school coordinator.

3. **The community school staff will recruit volunteers for, and coordinate an optional after school program that runs from 2:30-4, Mon.-Fri., starting the third week in each term and ending at the term's end.**

Discussion

More than half of the teachers said that the after-school program is a benefit their students received from the community school program. Community school records indicated that more than two hundred students per month took part in regularly scheduled after-school activities organized by the community school program and staffed by Escape tutors. Evaluators noted that several evening activities for children were offered. The Child Care and Development Center of the University of Oregon used the Edison/Eastside facilities for an after-school program for the children of University and Lane Community College students. Approximately thirteen children attended this program daily. When expanded in the spring to include children of working parents, thirty-five students attended daily. Based on teacher's statements it appears that students at Edison took part in after school activities more often than the Eastside students did.

4. **The community school staff will place at least one community resource person in each classroom requesting one for each school month.**

Discussion

The principal and seven teachers stated that the community school program is a benefit because it brings into the school community people who are an educational resource. Of the seven teachers who used speakers in their classrooms last year, three of the teachers said that the community school staff were involved in recruiting the speakers. The coordinator said that he received approximately three requests per month for resources from the teachers. A study of the number of requests made by teachers confirms this assertion.

5. **The community school staff will implement and coordinate an Apprenticeship program that will place one or two Eastside 4th,5th or 6th grade students each term in 70% of the local businesses and agencies, for two-three hours each week.**

Discussion

The principal and four of the Eastside teachers said that the Apprenticeship program was a benefit that students received from the community school program. All of the Eastside teachers interviewed

had students in the program. The teachers were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the Apprenticeship Program. The community school staff asked the agencies and businesses involved in the Apprenticeship Program to evaluate their experiences. Seventy percent of the businesses (seven out of ten) would use the program again. Sixty percent of the businesses saw the program as having a high value to them. Eighty-two percent of the students would like to become an apprentice again. The program appears to be successful and functioning well, however, it is not clear what the definition of a "local business and agency" is, therefore, the seventy percent criterion mentioned in the objective cannot be verified.

6. **The community school staff will implement and coordinate a Spring Interest Group for all Edison students that will offer at least 15 optional classes in April and May, during the regular school day.**

Discussion

The principal and half of the Edison teachers stated that the work that the community school does to provide interest groups is a benefit students received from the program. All of the teachers were aware that the community school organized the groups and provided volunteer help. Community School records indicated that there were sixteen optional classes offered to K-3 Edison students once a week in February and March, 1978, and sixteen optional classes were offered to 4-6 students twice a week in April, May and June, 1978. Five of the six Eastside teachers stated that the community school helped in organizing or providing activity leaders and volunteers for some of that school's optional activities.

7. **The Community school staff will take all Big Brother/Sister referrals for Edison and Eastside and process them through the campus and School Dist. Big Brother/Sister Program.**

Discussion

Four of the teachers interviewed said that they had students referred to the Big Brother/Sister Program last year. These teachers said that the community school coordinator handled all aspects of the referral.

Comments

It appears to the evaluators that the Edison/Eastside Community School completed all of its objectives under District Goal III. Seventy-five

percent of the teachers (eight out of twelve) were aware of ways that the community school program was a curriculum supplement. Eighty percent of the teachers (nine out of twelve) saw it as making them more effective.

The coordinator stated that the principal has a good understanding of community education and has been helpful in bringing the classroom program and the community school program together.

The program's strong points are that it is well organized, has maintained good records, and that the activities of the program's coordinator appear to be functioning well. It appears to the evaluators that the problems facing the program are a shortage of space in Edison and an increased work load for Edison/Eastside clerical staff, mainly increased telephone calls and drop-in visitors.

Ida Patterson Elementary School

Introduction

Ida Patterson became a full-time community school in 1973. The present coordinator has held that position since the program began. There have been three principals at Patterson since it became a community school. The current principal began at Patterson in 1977 and had no previous experience as an administrator in a community school. Six teachers were interviewed.

Patterson did not use the format for presenting goals and objectives used by the other community schools. Because of the differences in formats, evaluators picked three of the objectives deemed relevant to Goal III.

Goals and Objectives

1. The Community School Coordinator will provide each staff member with volunteer request forms by October 15 (and throughout the year) and recruit and place at least one volunteer per staff member as requested, by November 1 (and ongoing). Requests should average no more than two per staff member, prioritized. On all requests, the Coordinator will contact parents first, then other community members. Placements will be evaluated on a basis of mutual satisfaction between staff and volunteer.

Discussion

Five teachers interviewed used volunteers recruited by the community school program. The principal named several educational activities and services for students that would not have happened without the adult volunteers provided by the community school program. Many of the teachers did their own recruiting for parent volunteers. Teachers estimated that they used volunteers for approximately one hour each day. One teacher was not able to get any volunteers through the community school program.

2. Facilitate use of community based resources, ie. materials, persons, places.

Between October 1, 1977-April 15, 1978, the Community School Coordinator will assist the teaching staff in organizing a minimum of two educational projects per Center(primary ages and intermediate ages). The coordinator will survey the staff members at Center meetings for specific requests for resources, human and material. The coordinator will recruit and schedule the identified community resources on an agreed time schedule set with staff.

Discussion

The community school program provided teachers with assistance in afternoon interest groups. Three mini-classes were developed by the program for use by teachers in grades three through six. One learning packet, developed by the State of Oregon, was made available. The community school coordinator and a teacher cooperated in teaching the packet. The community school also provided speakers for this program. Teachers in the first, second, and third grades said that the community school program provides small group learning experiences in the city that their students would not get otherwise. The coordinator named two speakers that made presentations to primary level students. Teachers said that the community school helps with approximately ten percent of the interest groups. Due to the condition of community school records, it was not possible to determine how often other resource persons were used to supplement instructional activities.

3. Plan and implement afterschool program.

The Recreation Developer will plan, organize and supervise an after-school recreational program of four afternoons a week for K-6 Patterson students (in coordination with our Latch-Key program) during Fall and Winter terms. Standards for the program will be designed in consultation with the Community School Coordinator and instructional staff.

Discussion

All teachers interviewed were aware of an after-school program organized by the community school program. The primary level teachers estimated that fifty percent of their students took part in after-school activities when offered. The intermediate level teachers estimated that five percent of their students took part. The community school records were disorganized; it was not possible to determine how many students used the program or how often activities were offered.

Comments

Patterson Community School appears to evaluators to be providing community resources to teachers. In the opinion of the evaluators, the program was one hundred percent successful in meeting its objectives for Goal III. Primary level teachers were judged to be significantly more enthusiastic about the program than were intermediate level teachers. Half of the teachers said that their relationships with parents have improved as part of a general "better community feeling". This was the only community school in which teachers stated that the coordinator provides an orientation training session for volunteers. The principal perceives the coordinator to be a strength of the program.

Ida Patterson School (continued)

There appeared to be feelings among some of the teachers that the community school was demanding too much of their time. Most of the teachers did not consider activities of the coordinator's position to be well organized. Evaluators found evidence and believe that the program's organization should be improved. The program's strengths are: principal's leadership in blending the classroom program with the community school program, and the positive attitude towards the program of most of the staff.

Laurel Hill Elementary School

Introduction

Laurel Hill Elementary School became a half-time community school in 1971. In 1972, there was a full-time program, then half-time or quarter-time again until the 1978-79 school year, when the program was returned to full-time status. The coordinator for 1977-78 was hired in October, 1977, and left the program at the end of the 1977-78 school year. The Laurel Hill program had eight objectives implementing District Goal III. All four Laurel Hill teachers were interviewed.

Goals and Objectives

1. The community school coordinator and staff will offer to and help organize at least one field trip per month per classroom in to the local community and broader community, in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

Three teachers stated that the community school program is a resource for field trips. The four teachers took a total of fifteen trips and said the coordinator organized or was involved in the planning of most of them.

2. The community school coord. and staff will offer to and help make contacts, so that the teachers will have the opportunity to have at least one resource speaker in their class per month for the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

The principal and one teacher stated that the community school program is a resource because it provides speakers for the classroom. The four teachers had a total of six speakers in their classrooms. Three of the teachers did not know who invited the speakers. One teacher asked the speaker to come.

3. The community school coord. and staff will make available to the teachers at least 75% of the resources that are learned of at workshops and conferences that relate to school curriculum, in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

All of the teachers stated that the coordinator did give them some type of information from a workshop. One teacher was able to remember what it was. The new coordinator was unable to find any information in the files showing that information from workshops was given to teachers or that "seventy-five percent of resources" were made available.

4. The community school coord. and staff working with the teachers will organize at least 4 short classes (interest groups or mini groups) within the regular school day (probably one day per week for 4-6 weeks). which the children may choose among to attend. They will learn skills not taught in the regular classroom, such as guitar, puppetry, weaving, etc., This will start Winter Term 1978.

Discussion

The principal stated that organizing mini-groups was a way in which the community school program is a resource to the school's educational program. Mini-groups did not take place last year.

5. The community school council will invite at least one teacher to be at 90% of the community school council meetings in the school year 1977-78.

Discussion

Three of the teachers said they were invited to council meetings. One of the teachers attended some meetings.

6. The community school coord. and council will arrange and invite a person from the community interested in the school curriculum to come to 40% of school staff meetings to hear the problems of and to offer ideas to the teachers at the school in the school year 1977-78. (Yet to be agreed upon by the school staff).

Discussion

None of the teachers said that there were people from the community at staff meetings. The principal stated that the staff agreed that people could come to staff meetings, but that it was difficult to get them to come.

7. The community school coord. and staff working with the teachers will find one community person, parent or non-parent, to become a room representative to a classroom, for the school year 1977-78. This person would help p out the teacher with at least two-thirds of the special activities throughout the year and would attend at least 80% of the community council meetings held during the year 1977-78. One condition being that the room representative be given notice of at least one week before an activity or meeting. (Has to be approved by the school staff still)

Discussion

Two of the teachers had a room representative in 1977-78. In one of the classrooms, this room representative was a parent who was also a half-time district paid aide. In both cases the teachers stated that they recruited this person themselves.

8. The community school coord. and staff will organize and offer activities for the elementary age children. These activities will take place immediately after school at least 2 days per week. Each ~~the~~ day the children will be able to choose from at least 3 activities. The after school program will take place during the months Oct. - May.

Discussion

The three teachers who had an afternoon program named the after-school program as a benefit their students received in 1977-78 from the community school. Two teachers said that the mixing of children from Laurel Hill and Glenwood in after-school activities was especially valuable to them as teachers.

Comments

Although substantially more was promised than took place, the community school program at Laurel Hill Elementary School has made an impact on the educational program. In the opinion of the evaluators, two objectives were met, five were partially met, and one was unmet.

Teachers were generally familiar with what the community school was doing. There was general agreement among teachers about activities offered by the community school program. There appears to be some use of resources attributable to the presence of the community school.

Volunteer recruitment for the classroom teachers was an objective stated under District Goal V, and was not included in the above discussion. However, three of the four teachers said that the community school coordinator recruited volunteers for them. Both the present coordinator and the coordinator for the 1977-78 school year stated that the principal has been very supportive of the program.

Due to incomplete and/or missing records it is not possible to be certain whether objectives one, three, seven, and eight were met or not. The main weaknesses of the program were unrealistic objectives for the 1977-78 school year, a late start for the program in the fall of 1977, the lack of proper training and transition procedures for new coordinators, and a lack of continuous community involvement.

Lincoln Elementary School

Introduction

Lincoln Elementary School became a community school in 1971. There has been a full-time program at Lincoln since 1974. The present coordinator has held the position since 1973. Lincoln had five objectives implementing district Goal III. Six teachers were interviewed.

Goals and Objectives

Objective 1 -
The CAC by mid-October will decide on 3 social and fund-raising events during the school year of 77-78. The monies will then be available for the Lincoln Community School, K-6th grade teachers to use on projects approved by the CAC.

Discussion

Parking cars during the County Fair, rummage and bake sales, and sports contests with a local radio station were fund raising events at Lincoln during the 1977-78 school year. Approximately $900 was raised and was used primarily for playground equipment, the outdoor school, and field trips.

Objective 2 -
The CAC and the community school staff during the 77-78 school year will help in conducting special programs for school children, i.e.: New games, pottery class.

Discussion

The coordinator cited two types of special programs for school children: after-school activities, and special activities during the school day. The teachers interviewed were well aware of the after-school program and the activities it offered. Four of the teachers felt that the after-school program was a benefit to children that the community school offers. Examination of the program's records showed that a variety of activities was regularly offered. An average of fifty-five students per week took part in afternoon activities. This is in addition to thirty students enrolled in the daily Latch Key program. Teachers estimated that forty percent of their students participated in the after-school and Latch Key programs regularly.

According to community school records, there were twelve special projects using community resources which took place during the regular school day. Four of the teachers said that they found the community school program helpful in meeting their needs for special resources. Classroom speakers were recruited for teachers by the program.

Objective 3 -
The Lincoln community school staff and the CAC, during the 77-78 school year, will assist the Lincoln school elementary teachers in grades 1 - 6 in the afternoon Interest Groups by recruiting 3 volunteer leaders, providing supplies, and community resources.

Discussion

Four of the teachers stated that there were "interest groups" at Lincoln in 1977-78. One teacher said that volunteers helped occasionally. The coordinator stated that the community school program helped these activities by providing two leaders in the fall and one in the winter. There were no interest groups held during spring term because not enough volunteers could be found to put the activities on.

Objective 4 -
The Lincoln community school staff will develop and assist in the implementation of 3 educational community learning packets for teachers with grades 3 - 6. These are designed to promote the use of the community as a learning resource.

Discussion

Four of the teachers interviewed used "learning packets" provided by the community school program. These teachers were satisfied with the materials provided. The coordinator stated that the packets were developed in response to specific teacher requests. There were five packets developed in 1977-78.

Objective 5 -
The Lincoln community school staff, in the 77 -78 school year, will promote community involvement in the Lincoln Elementary School, K-6 program by recruiting volunteers.

Discussion

The principal and three of the teachers interviewed stated that recruitment of volunteers was a resource that the community school provides to the classroom teacher. Four of the teachers interviewed used volunteers. All of the teachers said that volunteers were recruited by the community school program. The teachers were satisfied with the volunteers, preferring Escape tutors from the University of Oregon over the volunteers from Action High.

The coordinator said that the Escape program was the most helpful of all the groups that provided volunteers. Neighborhood and parent volunteers were judged more willing to become involved in a one-time project than in long-term projects. According to the coordinator, parents were the hardest group to get to volunteer due to the large number of working parents in the area.

Comments

In the opinion of evaluators, the Lincoln program was ninety percent successful in meeting its objectives for Goal III. Objectives two and five contained no performance criteria and could not be measured for completeness. The coordinator stated that the principal's support for the program has been enthusiastic.

The Lincoln program is apparently an established, successful program which offers a broad variety of activities for children. The only weakness noted by the evaluators was volunteer recruitment.

Whiteaker Elementary School

Introduction

Whiteaker Elementary School was the first school in Eugene to become a community school. It has had a full-time program since 1971. The present coordinator began in April, 1978; her predecessor had been coordinator for three years. The present coordinator threw away most of the existing community school records, making verification activities impossible. The principal has been at Whiteaker for two years.

The Whiteaker program had four objectives implementing district Goal III. Six teachers and both the past and present coordinators were interviewed.

Goals and Objectives

1. **The C.S. staff will develop and refine a volunteer program to expand the use of volunteer resources, both within and outside of the community, by 50% for the total Whiteaker program, ongoing basis, June-June.**

2. **The C.S. staff will recruit volunteers to meet 75% of the requests from the instructional staff for the required curriculum, within the specified time frame, ongoing throughout the school year.**

Discussion

Five of the six teachers interviewed said the community school program recruits volunteers. Two teachers used volunteers last year; seventy percent of their requests were met. Neither the principal nor the teachers thought that the 1977-78 coordinator was a successful recruiter of volunteers. There is no information available about the volunteer program because lists of volunteers were thrown away.

3. **The C.S. staff will expand the number of afternoons in programming for youth for the winter term to 6 days, and will maintain an afterschool program 5 days a week from October to June, to be publicized to all children K-6 grades.**

Discussion

Half of the teachers interviewed said that after-school programs were a benefit that their students received from the community school. While all of the teachers knew an after-school program existed, two were unsure of the community school program's role in these activities.

Teachers' estimates of how many children took part in after-school activities varied, from less than ten percent to forty-five percent of their classes.

According to the coordinator, information about after-school activities was publicized in bi-weekly flyers and the school newspapers. There is no data about after-school activities available in the community school files.

4. **The C.S. staff will cooperate with outreach workers in identifying at least 3 community businesses for involvement as resources to meet needs of required/optional education programs, and as necessary representatives to provide input for the council, before June, 1977.**

Discussion

A member of the community school staff stated that twenty or more local businesses donated materials or money to the community school. The materials were used as door prizes at the school carnival. The money was used to put on the carnival and for community school sponsored family trips. Several businesses were members of the Community Economic Development Committee. One of the teachers interviewed said that money and materials were received from two local businesses. These donations were used for a class trip.

Comments

In the opinion of the evaluators, the program was sixty-three percent successful in meeting its objectives for Goal III. Two objectives were met and one was partially met. This differs from the self-assessment of June 1978 in which all the objectives were considered completed. Due to the lack of records Objective One could not be measured for completeness.

Most of the teachers interviewed at Whiteaker made little or no use of the community school in 1977-78. The intermediate level teachers as a group appeared to evaluators to be more verbally supportive of the community school and have used it for resources. The primary level teachers appeared on the whole to be unsupportive and uninformed about the program. As a group they did not see the community school as a resource to them or their students. Four of the eight school staff interviewed considered the principal to be at best moderately supportive of the 1977-78 program. When asked about the lack of support for the program among certain staff members, the principal stated that some teachers will use the program and some will not. He further stated that the 1977-78 program should have placed more emphasis on activities that benefited classroom instruction.

Willagillespie Elementary School

Introduction

Willagillespie was first funded as a half-time community school in 1974. In 1977-78, the community school was funded as a full-time program for the first time. The current coordinator and principal have held their positions since the program began.

Willagillespie had five objectives implementing district Goal III.

Goals and Objectives

1. The community school coordinator will recruit for and coordinate the volunteer program (in-school and optional time volunteers) during the 1977-78 year.

   a. The coordinator will successfully meet 75% of the volunteer requests made by teachers for assistance in the 1977-78 year. Sucessfully meeting a request means providing a volunteer, by the starting date listed, who has the time and talent that is required by the teacher.
   b. The coordinator will establish three means of recruiting potential volunteers for the volunteer program by October 1977.
   c. The coordinator will develop and reproduce a guideline handbook for distribution to Willagillespie volunteers by January 1978.

Discussion

The principal and three teachers stated that the community school program provided educational resources through its volunteer program. Of the four teachers who used volunteers, two did so primarily for grading papers. Two teachers did their own recruiting. Teachers said that more than ninety percent of their requests for volunteers were met. A tutorial program set up between the coordinator and a reading specialist provided volunteer tutors for children with reading difficulties on a regular basis. The coordinator stated five different ways in which volunteers were recruited. A handbook providing guidelines for volunteers was developed.

2. The community school coordinator will inform the faculty at each months staff meeting or at grade level meetings of current community resources available to them for curriculum enrichment during the 1977-78 year

Discussion

The principal and three teachers stated that the community school program is a benefit because of the community resources which it makes available. Two types of resource files have been set up; one of the files is in the teachers staff room. The coordinator stated that teachers have been told of resources available at staff meetings. All of the teachers interviewed were aware of the resource file in the staff room. The teachers said that the coordinator did make announcements about resources at meetings. Only one teacher was able to recall what information was announced. None of the teachers interviewed used the file in the staff room.

3. The community school coordinator will coordinate the optional time school-community activities requested by students, staff parents and community. Coordination incluces scheduleing the school building, providing publicity and supervision during the 1977-78 year.

Discussion

Two of the teachers stated their students benefited from the increased activities available through the community school after-school program. The coordinator named several projects which involved the community school program: Eugene Sports Program activities for boys and girls, Scouts for primary and intermediate children, dances, after-school trips, a student newspaper, and School-Mate, an after-school program modeled after the Latch Key program. According to the records available, an average of one hundred eighty children per week participated in optional activities sponsored in whole or in part by the community school program. In addition, twenty-eight children attended the School-Mate program on a daily basis. Three of the teachers interviewed appeared less than satisfied with the after-school programs especially the operation and usefulness of the scouting and School-Mate programs. No attempt was made by evaluators to verify what activities were put on for adults.

Comments

Willagillespie was one hundred percent successful in completing its objectives for Goal III. The teachers interviewed appeared to be aware of the types of resources available from the community school program. However, half of the teachers made little or no use of the program in 1977-78. It appears that those teachers who used the program to obtain classroom volunteers got most of their needs met.

Teachers appear to be reluctant to use the resources available from the community school program. Due to the fact that Willagillespie is a school that emphasizes basic skills, the integration of community resources in the classroom has not been a high priority of the principal. It is recommended that better performance criteria be built into the program's goals.

A Summary of How Many Objectives Were Completed

Table III shows, by school, which objectives evaluators considered to be partially met or unmet. The seven schools had thirty-six objectives. Overall, nineteen of the thirty-six were considered to have been met, twelve partially met, four unmet, and one was not verifiable.

TABLE III

School Objectives for District Goal
Which Were Met, Partially Met, or Unmet

	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5	Objective 6	Objective 7	Objective 8
Dunn	Partially met	Partially met	Unmet	Partially met	Unmet	Unmet	Partially met	Partially met
Edison/Eastside	Met	Met	Met	Met	---	Met	---	---
Patterson	Met	Met	Met	---	---	---	---	---
Laurel Hill	Partially met	Partially met	Partially met	Unmet	Met	Partially met	Partially met	Met
Lincoln	Met	Met	Partially met	Met	Met	---	---	---
Whiteaker	Not verifiable	Met	Partially met	Met	---	---	---	---
Willagillespie	Met	Met	Met	---	---	---	---	---

A Comparative Look at Schools With and Without Community School Programs

This part contains a comparison between community and non-community schools of community resources for the "required and optional curriculum and instruction" as stated in District Goal III. An effort was made to determine whether or not these activities for children and resources for teachers which community school programs wish to provide are available to the teacher in a non-community school.

Seven non-community schools having attendance areas contiguous to the community schools were chosen for the comparison. The teachers in schools without community school programs were asked questions similar to those

asked of the community school teachers. Areas in which different levels of activity might be expected are use of speakers, classroom volunteers, field trips and after-school programs.

Classroom Speakers

Table IV compares the use of speakers, often called "resource speakers" among teachers in community schools and teachers in schools not having a community school program. A slightly higher percentage of the non-community school teachers (seventy-six percent) used resource speakers than did community school teachers (sixty-seven percent). This difference is not statistically significant. The non-community school teachers were responsible for one hundred percent of speaker recruitment. Thirty-nine percent of the community school teachers who used speakers said that the community school program staff was involved in bringing speakers into their classroom.

TABLE IV

Use of Classroom Speakers
By Community School and Non-Community School Teachers
1977-78 School Year

	Community Schools	Non-Community Schools
Teachers who said they used speakers in their classrooms	67% (31/46)*	76% (34/45)
Teachers who said they did their own recruiting for speakers	90% (28/31)	100% (34/34)
Teachers who stated that community school program staff helped in speaker recruitment	39% (12/31)	-------
Average number of speakers per teacher	2.90	3.65

*The numbers in parentheses indicate that 31 teachers out of the 46 community school teachers interviewed said they used speakers in their classroom last year.

Use of Classroom Volunteers

Table V compares the use of classroom volunteers by teachers. Students from the University of Oregon Escape Tutor Program were included in the definition of a volunteer. Student teachers were not considered to be volunteers. In both community schools and non-community schools seventy-eight of the teachers interviewed used volunteers.

TABLE V

Use of Classroom Volunteers by Community School and Non-Community School Teachers, 1977-78 School Year

	Community Schools	Non-Community Schools
Teachers who used volunteers in their classrooms	78% (36/46)	78% (35/45)*

*The number in parenthesis indicate that thirty-five teachers out of the forty-five non-community school teachers interviewed said they used volunteers in their classrooms.

All of the community school teachers said that the community school program staff did volunteer recruitment.

All teachers were asked who recruits volunteers for them to help in the classroom. Table V shows the answers to this question. In schools with community programs, thirty-nine percent of the teachers said that they recruit their own volunteers, generally parents. One hundred percent of the teachers said the community school coordinator recruits volunteers for them and two percent said that the principals and counselors recruit volunteers. In schools without community school programs, approximately one-third of the teachers report recruiting volunteers. However, counselors, principals, "curriculum associates," and parents do the rest of the recruiting.

TABLE VI

Who Recruits Volunteers for Teachers?

	Answers of Teachers in Community Schools	Answers of Teachers in Non-Community Schools
Teachers	39% (18/46)*	33% (15/45)
Community School Coordinators	100% (44/46)	-------
Principals	2% (1/46)	16% (7/45)
Counselors	2% (1/46)	43% (15/45)
Curriculum associate+		13% (6/45)
Parent		13% (6/45)

* The numbers in parenthesis indicate that eighteen of the forty-six community school teachers interviewed said they also recruited volunteers.

+ A "curriculum associate" is a teacher who has been given part-time administrative responsibilities.

The percents for recruiters in both types of schools are more than one hundred because teachers did their own recruiting in addition to whatever other recruiting may be done in their school.

Field Trips

The number of field trips taken by teachers in the two sets of schools is compared in Table VII. A field trip was broadly defined to be any organized activity for students that occurred outside the school. This included walking outings to the area around the school as well as excursions using bus transportation.

The ninety-six percent of the community school teachers who took field trips took an average of 4.7 trips per teacher. Eighty-nine percent of the teachers at non-community schools took field trips. They took an average of 3.0 trips during the school year. These differences are not statistically significant. All teachers in non-community schools and eighty-five percent in community schools said they organized their own field trips. Thirty percent of the community school teachers who took field trips said that community school staff helped organize them.

TABLE VII

The Number of Field Trips Taken by Community School and Non-Community School Teachers, 1977-78 School Year

	Answers of Teachers in Community Schools	Answers of Teachers in Non-Community Schools
Teachers who said they took field trips during the 1977-78 school year	96% (44/46)	89% (41/45)*
Average number of field trips taken per teacher	4.7	3.0
Field trips organized by teachers	84% (37/44)	100% (41/41)
Teachers who said community school staff helped organize trips	30% (13/44)	-------

* The numbers in parentheses indicate that forty-one of the forty-five teachers interviewed in the seven non-community schools said they took a field trip during the 1977-78 school year.

After-School Activities

Table VIII shows differences in after-school activities available for children. Sixty-seven percent of the non-community school teachers said that their school had an after-school program compared to ninety-six percent of the community school teachers who said their school had after-school activities. This difference is statistically significant. In the community schools, one hundred percent of the teachers said that the community school program staff organized the after-school activities. Community schools offered more varied activities than did the non-community schools, which offered mostly sports programs. Community schools offered, in addition to ESP, arts and crafts, educational activities, dancing and physical education activities. A listing of these activities can be found in the Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports.

TABLE VIII

Organized After-School Activities
at Community Schools and Non-Community Schools

	Answers of Teachers in Community Schools	Answers of Teachers in Non-Community Schools
Teachers who said their school has an after-school program	96% (44/46)*	67% (30/45)
Teachers' perceptions of who organizes after-school activities		
Community school program staff	100%	---
Eugene Parks and Recreation	29%	29%
Eugene Sports Programs	29%	57%
Parents	---	29%
Latch Key	---	14%

* The numbers in parentheses indicate that forty-four of the forty-six teachers in schools with community programs said their school had an after-school program for children.

GOAL IV

Goal IV of the "City and District Goals for Community Schools" is "to expand the level of communication and cooperation among existing community agencies, public and private, and all segments in the delivery of needed community programs and services."

Results of Interviewing Organizations That Used the Community School Program

The first step in collecting data on the accomplishment of the goal was to identify how many organizations used the community school programs. The Year-End Evaluation Report, published by the community schools program, contains 279 names of organizations using the community schools operations during the 1977-78 fiscal year. Evaluators constructed an unduplicated list containing 190 names. Each community school was asked to supply the name and telephone number of a person associated with each organization that used their program. Contact information was provided for 155 organizations. A search of the 1978-79 Pacific Northwest Bell Eugene-Springfield telephone book and the June 1, 1978 Community Services Directory, published by the Lane County Health and Social Services Department yielded an additional twenty-four telephone numbers.

To gain a more complete understanding of the services being provided by and through the community schools, it was decided that these organizations should be surveyed.

The second step in the analysis of this goal was to develop a sixteen-item questionnaire. It was designed to elicit information about who participated in a particular group's activities, how beneficial was the use of the community program to that group, and whether the community programs were meeting their stated goals concerning organizations and agencies. Each organization was also asked the nature of its activities in or involvement with the community schools and their degree of satisfaction or problems experienced in dealing with the community program.

Evaluators made approximately 550 telephone calls to complete the interviews. The average interview took approximately ten minutes to complete.

Based on the results of the answers, the organizations were divided into seven groups:

1. Those sixty-seven organizations which used only community schools for their functions. This includes organizations which provide various services at other locations, but the service or activity provided at the community school was not offered anywhere else. Included in Group 1 are organizations such as clubs, neighborhood associations, adult recreational education classes, child care and special programs of city, county, and state agencies.

2. Those twenty-three organizations which offered their programs at other facilities in addition to the community schools. Included are Eugene Parks and Recreation, Eugene Sports Program, Boy and Girl Scouts and Lane Community College Adult Education, among others.

3. Those twenty-three organizations whose facilities were used for a function organized by the community school. For example, these include tours of newspapers, skating parties, and work experience for neighborhood children.

4. Those sixteen organizations with which the community schools had some contact, but which provided no programs as such for residents of the area or the city at large. These include discussions with staff about future programs, and donations of goods to school acitivites.

5. Those ten organizations which provided help to the community schools in the form of aides to set up or administer programs, or help in the regular school program.

6. Those fifteen organizations which, when contacted, could recall little or no interaction with the community schools last year.

7. Those thirty-six organizations which could not be contacted because no telephone number was provided or available through other sources. Also included are those organizations for which wrong or disconnected numbers were provided.

Table IX is a count of the number of programs either verified through interviews or not verified but listed by the community school programs in their reports. The counts are for each school within each of the seven categories described above. The totals are only roughly comparable with those listed in the Year-End Community Schools Evaluation Report, because some claimed contacts were not verified and other contacts which were not listed by a particular school were subsequently found during the interviews. There is also error because the majority of those interviewed relied on memory alone to recall the requested information. However, if the school which had listed that organization was not mentioned spontaneously by the organization, the interviewer named that school to make sure it had not simply been overlooked.

(See Table IX on following page)

TABLE IX

Numbers of Organizations Which Were Used or Listed by the Community Schools, From Format 3-F, Item 3, Year-End Evaluation

GROUP	1 Used Only Comm. Schools	2 Used Other Facilities	3 Comm. Schools Used Others' Facilities	4 Some Contact No Programs	5 Aides (1 per Aide Source)	6 No Contact Recalled	7 No Final Contact Made
Dunn	6	9	1	1	2	0	3
Edison	28	15	14	3	4	7	10
Laurel Hill	6	6	5	6	4	6	13
Lincoln	14	13	2	1	8	0	2
Patterson	14	14	2	5	8	1	4
Whiteaker	9	14	4	4	4	0	7
Willagillespie	11	9	0	4	3	1	2

Table IX indicates that there is a wide range in the number of organizations using each school. Adding the first two columns on the left of Table IX, for Groups 1 and 2, shows the number of verified users of the community school facilities varies from twelve at Laurel Hill to forty-three at Edison/Eastside. Sixty-seven percent of the verified organizational contacts involved a use of the school's facilities. The other one-third of the verified contacts did not.

Groups 3 through 5 are other types of contacts which the schools had with outside organizations and the range here is from four at Dunn to twenty-one at Edison/Eastside. For example, ten of Edison/Eastside programs in Group 3 were businesses participating in an "apprenticeship" program in which students work in the business. The Edison program is an innovative and apparently successful idea.

Groups 6 and 7 contain organizations whose contact with the community program could not be verified. The Edison/Eastside coordinator provided telephone numbers and names for nine of the ten organizations listed in Group 7. However, the telephone numbers were either wrong, disconnected, or did not return calls after five attempts. The Laurel Hill program was unable to provide any information on the majority of the organizations listed under Group 7. Both Edison/Eastside and Laurel Hill had a relatively larger number of entries in Group 6. Part of the problem in Group 6 is a failure by organization people to recall a contact which did occur during the past twelve months. However, entries in both Groups 6 and 7 indicate a need for tighter record keeping.

For further comparison, the seven groups are collapsed into three groups in Table X. The three groupings are those organizations which most legitimately should have been listed in Item 3 of the Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation Reports, those with which contact of some sort was verified, and those with which no contact was verified.

TABLE X

Numbers of Organizations Which Used or Had Contact With Community Schools or Whose Contact Could Not be Verified

	Used Community School Operations	Some Contact With Comm. Schools	No Contact Verified
Dunn	15	4	3
Edison	43	21	17
Laurel Hill	12	15	19
Lincoln	27	11	2
Patterson	28	15	5
Whiteaker	23	12	7
Willagillespie	20	7	3
TOTALS	168* (90)	85* (49)	56* (51)

*These totals include duplications since an organization can use more than one school's facilities. The unduplicated totals are included in parentheses.

Results of the Interviews

The questions asked during the telephone interviews were found to apply only to organizations classified under Groups 1, 2, and 5, since those questions dealt with use of and experience in the community schools.

The major reason for separating Groups 1 and 2 was to allow comparisons between organizations which could judge the relative advantages of community schools (Group 2) with organizations with had no experience except in the

community schools (Group 1). The responses of Group 5 were recorded but were not found to be suitable for comparative analysis.

The most important findings from the interview data are:

1. The community school initiated contact with ten percent (7) of the Group 1 organizations and eighteen percent (4) of Group 2 organizations. Therefore, in the large majority of cases the organizations themselves were responsible for bringing their programs to the community schools.

2. Thirty-four percent (23) of the Group 1 organizations said they could not have offered their programs if the community schools had not been available to them. Furthermore, thirty-three percent (22) of Group 1 and thirty-nine percent (9) of Group 2 said they would have found it more difficult to offer their particular programs in the absence of community schools.

3. Seventy percent (47) of Group 1 organizations said they were able to save money or staff time by using community schools, compared to forty-eight percent (11) of Group 2 organizations. Forty-six percent (41) of both Groups 1 and 2 combined were subsequently able to offer more to the participants in their programs.

4. Fully eighty-two percent (55) of Group 1 organizations felt that their activities did not duplicate any others being offered in that community. An additional six percent (4) had met with community school staff to avoid duplication of effort. No attempt was made by evaluators to measure the degree of duplication. A superficial review indicates that duplication of programs does not appear to be a problem. Stronger evidence of duplication would be desirable before a study of its presence is made. Its possibility was only mentioned during the interviews once by a representative from Lane Community College, but a preliminary check revealed that there were no classes being sponsored by the community schools which could have been provided by Lane Community College.

Also, the community center coordinators and others at Eugene Parks and Recreation stated that they met regularly with community school coordinators to discuss programming. The sports programs were another area of possible duplication. For example, there is often more than one adult basketball team at a particular school. When questioned, however, each felt that they were not duplicating the efforts of the others. Sometimes the membership was drawn from a particular organization, or one team was part of a competitive league while another was simply a way for its members to obtain exercise and relaxation.

5. Eighty-three percent (56) of Group 2 organizations serve local community residents only compared to forty-six percent (31) of Group 1.

6. Twenty-seven percent (18) of Group 1 organizations felt that they had interacted more with other organizations as a direct result of their work with the community schools. However, thirty-three percent (22) felt that either they had no need for increased communication with other organizations, or that they already had their own communication network. The corresponding Group 2 figures are thirty percent (7) and thirteen percent (3) respectively.

7. Fifty-one percent (60) of organizations in Groups 1 and 2 combined stated that their communication with area residents increased. Forty-eight percent of those organizations whose participants came from all over the metropolitan area said communication with area residents improved. Community school newsletters were thought to be an important reason for much of the communication which did exist. On the other hand, only seventeen percent (15) of Groups 1 and 2 combined, felt that attendance at their activity was improved because they were at a community school. Sixty percent (40) of Group 1 organizations did not feel this question was applicable to them because they were simply using the facility and attendance increase was not a concern.

8. Descriptions of the organizations' activities were elicited during the interviews. From the nature of the activities described, it was found that roughly fourteen percent (14) of organizations in Groups 1, 2, and 5 held at least some of their activities for students during school hours.

9. The number of "people visits" attributable to each organization was estimated by multiplying the average meeting size by the frequency of the meetings. Sixty-three of the sixty-seven organizations in Group 1 gave some estimates of attendance, and ten of the twenty-three in Group 2 gave estimates. It was not feasible to obtain exact figures from all organizations, especially the larger programs in Group 2, but the estimates which were obtained appear in Table XI.

TABLE XI

"People Visits" for Organizations in Groups 1 and 2 by School Based on Reported Organizational Estimates, 1977-78 School Year

Dunn	500
Edison/Eastside	15,000
Laurel Hill	4,200
Lincoln	9,700
Patterson	11,000
Whiteaker	8,600
Willagillespie	8,300

These figures should not be used alone to compare the size of a particular community school's program, but are useful when used in conjunction with individual school data from other parts of this report.

10. Approximately eight percent (5) of the Group 1 organizations have been using the schools for four or more years. On the other hand, fifty-four percent (12) of the Group 2 organizations have been using the schools for four or more years.

Did the Community Schools Studied Attain Goal IV?

Goal IV is "To expand the level of communication and cooperation among existing community agencies, public and private, and all segments in the delivery of needed community programs and services."

The wording of this goal is ambiguous. Evaluators interpret it to mean that the community school is to improve communication and cooperation "among" the existing agencies, on the one hand, and also to improve communication and cooperation between the agencies and "all segments (of the local community)."

None of the seven community schools studied had as an objective to expand the level of communication or cooperation among the existing agencies. Twenty-eight percent (25) of organizations in Groups 1 and 2 felt that they had interacted more with other organizations as a result of their experience at the community schools.

A question arises as to whether this should even be a task of the community schools at the individual school level. Community school programs can be held accountable for their contacts with organizations. However, the programs cannot properly be held accountable for contacts that organizations have among themselves. The current head of the Community Schools Coordinating Committee, a committee which contains a representative for each school's community advisory council, feels that promoting cooperation among organizations is an appropriate task for the coordinating committee.

The second part of Goal IV is being partially met. The community school programs are sending information to local residents.

Fifty-one percent (46) of all organizations in Groups 1 and 2 felt that their communication with residents in the community school areas had improved, primarily through newsletters. Thirty-eight percent (34) of the organizations thought that one or more people had been referred to them by the community school. The impact on attendance was not profound, however,

since only seventeen percent (15) of the organizations in Groups 1 and 2 felt that attendance of their meetings was improved by their being at a community school.

Conclusion

The wide variety of interactions between the community schools and organizations indicates that the schools are creatively exploring the full spectrum of resources available to them. Sixty-seven organizations used only schools with community programs. It is reasonable to infer that a wider variety of activities are occurring in schools with community programs.

The number of programs provided by outside organizations differs markedly from school to school and may be attributed both to the interest shown by local residents, and the effectiveness of the community school staff in arousing that interest and in satisfying it with appropriate programming.

The organizations themselves are very happy with their experience at the community schools and many find them indispensable for delivering their programs at a very local level. Others simply use the space for their own functions and find the community schools to be well located and in many cases essential to their existence.

The mechanism which presently exists for record keeping and evaluation needs some improvement. As was mentioned, a number of organizations could not be contacted and many others were associated with the community schools in ways which did not fit the present semi-annual evaluation format.

Finally, Goal IV has been partially met by the community schools. However, rather than require the schools to strive to achieve Goal IV as it has been interpreted in this evaluation, the goal itself should first be scrutinized. It may be that community schools are not in a position to improve communication and cooperation between organizations beyond simple referrals and information dissemination.

GOAL V

Goal V of the city and school district goals is "to expand the use of existing school and community facilities and human resources to their maximum usefulness."

This goal was no studied. A proper study of facility usage requires measurements on the degree to which the facilities are used. How long are the buildings open and what proportion of the building's space is being used? Moreover, a good study would require a comparative measurement of building usage in schools with and without community school programs. This study was not undertaken because the data collected would have had to occur during July, August, and September, but the results obtained could not be generalized to any other month.

A Survey of Community School Advisory Council Members

At the request of the district's Community School Advisory Council, a survey was sent to thirty-nine randomly selected people who participated in community school advisory council meetings. Nineteen questionnaires were returned. The low response rate and the lack of knowledge about the characteristics of people who did not respond make interpretation of the results difficult.

A reading of the returned questionnaires yielded additional information on three subjects discussed elsewhere in this report. First, the response rates were best from Edison and Lincoln, adding to the impression that programs at these two schools are functioning well.

Second, when asked "Would you please describe anything that the organization or school should be doing but is not doing?" Respondents associated with three schools commented on the importance of the school's principal. For example, two respondents from one school said the principal was neither knowledgeable nor supportive of the program, and respondents at two other schools said the principals were perceived to attend meetings or be supportive of community advisory council activities. In general, people associated with the community schools program continually stressed to evaluators the importance of the principal in incorporating the program into the school.

Third, respondents were asked a series of questions as to how activities were organized at their school. The answers indicated that a loose, consensus decision-making process is apparently in use. Items are raised as individuals see fit. Projects are organized as an interest in them exists and resources become available. There are no limits as to what can be talked about or how many people can participate. While respondents showed a general knowledge of community school activities, few were able to identify school specific goals or a list of priorities that their particular school was working on. The management tool invisioned in Goal I, which required a systematic listing of needs and resources and a "coordinated program" to match them, is not used to its full potential by advisory councils. The informal climate of advisory council decision making and the use of a formal management tool has not been blended.

The Lack of Accountability in the Chain of Command

A review of the job descriptions of the "Community School Coordinator" and "Community Services Specialist" indicates that the program lacks accountability. The Specialist is responsible "for the overall development, organization, operation, coordination, and evaluation of the Community School Program." On the other hand, the ten school coordinators "will be directly accountable to the principal." Additionally, the Specialist does not have budgetary control over the coordinators' actions, but "assists the principal...."

The management functions of "organization, operation, and coordination" which the Specialist is required to perform, cannot be done efficiently given that the program's workers and their budgets are accountable to ten other administrators. Even advisory activities become difficult if other administrators are unsympathetic to the program. Ambiguities in the administrative chain of command also encourage minor inefficiencies. For example, a review of Personnel Office records show that five classified people were employed last year as community school coordinators. Two of the five did not have an annual evaluation done on them. The 1977-80 collective bargaining agreement between the district and the Oregon School Employees Association states in section 2.5.1 that "Employees shall be evaluated each year." The Specialist cannot be held accountable for this situation.

Concluding Comments

During the 1977-78 fiscal year, the community school program had five goals and 275 objectives. Broadly defined goals, too many objectives, episodic planning, and managerial weaknesses have fragmented program efforts. Critical objectives are not systematically identified nor are resources concentrated in ways that yield high payoffs.

Lacking a focus, the program's data collection also lack a focus. Too much information is being collected and information about productive activities is not emphasized. People typically do not know why they are collecting data or what to do with it after they have it. Consequently, resources are not concentrated in high productive activities and unproductive activities are not sloughed off.